

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/016,998	12/14/2001	Paul A. Kline	CRNT-0034	4988
7590 10/18/2005			EXAMINER	
Manelli Denise	on & Selter	PAYNE, DAVID C		
2000 M Street,	N.W.			
Suite 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20036-3307			2638	
			D. WE	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/016,998	KLINE, PAUL A.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David C. Payne	2638
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Ju  2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This  3)□ Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro-	
Disposition of Claims		
<ul> <li>4)</li></ul>	vn from consideration.  9 and 61 is/are rejected.	ation.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	·	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Intention Summer.	(DTO 412)
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) L Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/016,998

Art Unit: 2638

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. It is noted that the applicant has submitted an over 300 prior art references for this application ranging over the following classes:

119	16	178	202
24	241	257	292
307	312	323	324
333	33	336	340
359	361	365	370
375	379	380	381
385	398	40	417
439	441	455	510
600	700	702	705
713	714	717	725
726	74	83	99

While every attempt is made to review the applicant's prior art in detail, such a large submission of diverse references can cause the Office to miss particularly relevant material. Therefore, the Examiner is requesting that the applicant cite the particular material in the submitted references (i.e., figures and/or text) that they believe is relevant to their claimed invention.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2638

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-24, 26-40, 43-46, 50-59 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown US 6,282,405 B1 (Brown) in view of Cern US 6452482 B1 (Cern) and Croushore et al. US 6278357 B1 (Croushore).

Re claim 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-24, 26-35, 40, 58, 59, 61 Brown disclosed the method whereby a network linking a plurality of premises comprising a section of broadband telecommunications network and a plurality of electrical power cables each connected to a respective one of the premises for supplying mains electrical power thereto, each of said power cables also being connected to the section of broadband telecommunications network so that telecommunications signals are transmissible between the section of broadband telecommunications network and each of said power cables, wherein a telecommunications signal is transmissible to and/or from said plurality of premises by being transmitted along the section of broadband telecommunications network and also along the respective power cable of each of said premises. The power transmission/distribution network being used to propagate the telecommunications signal from the telecommunications network into e.g. the premises of a user and vice versa i.e. the communications may be bi-directional. The broadband telecommunications network may be a standard broadband distribution network e.g. a coaxial, twisted pair or fiber cable (e.g., col./line: 2/22-45, 2/50-55). Brown does not disclose the network condition unit (Figure 8) as a bypass transformer. Cern disclosed a medium voltage- low voltage bypass transformer (MV-LV), see Cern col./lines: 1/25-35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a MV-LV transformer to keep the feed resistance low which is desirable to maintain reasonable lever of voltage regulation, see e.g., Cern col./lines: 2/5-15. Brown does not disclose the fiber optic transceiver and modem together. Croushore disclosed such an arrangement, see Figures 6 and 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to connect the data communications up to the power lines in this manner since, PCs are well known in the art to communicate over modems in a high speed fashion over fiber

Art Unit: 2638

transmission.

Re claims 36-39, 43 – 46, the modified invention disclosed of routers in communication an optical/power network, see Cern col./lines: 14/60-65.

Re claims 50-57, the modified invention disclosed a low, medium and high voltage network implementations, Cern col./lines: 2/5-15.

4. Claim 3, 4, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown US 6,282,405 B1 (Brown) in view of Cern US 6452482 B1 (Cern) and Croushore et al. US 6278357 B1 (Croushore) as applied to claims 1 and 36 above, and in further view of Hylton et al. 5,630,204 (Hylton). Re claim 3, 41 the modified invention of Brown, Cern and Croushore as taught disclosed the aforementioned invention but does not disclose where the focus signal is compliant with the Synchronous Optical Network Standard (SONET). Hylton disclosed a ADSL bay connected to a SONET fiber optical fiber (217 of Figure 2, col./lines: 7/7-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use SONET as the networking standard over the optic fiber since it is the predominant standard for public optical networks and used as an interoperable standard for many optical telecommunication devices.

Re claim 4 Brown disclosed telecommunications RF signals e.g. television signals, which may be analogue and/or digital format (e.g., col./lines: 8/39-41).

Art Unit: 2638

**Conclusion** 

Page 5

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (571) 272-3024. The examiner can normally

be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dcp

David C. Payne **Patent Examiner** 

**AU 2638**